



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/849,318	05/19/2004	Paul Gassoway	063170.7177	5789
5073	7590	08/09/2010	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.			LOUIE, OSCAR A	
2001 ROSS AVENUE				
SUITE 600			ART UNIT	
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			PAPER NUMBER	
			2436	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			08/09/2010	
			ELECTRONIC	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com  
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

<p align="center"><b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p>	<p><b>Application No.</b> 10/849,318</p>	<p><b>Applicant(s)</b> GASSOWAY, PAUL</p>	
	<p><b>Examiner</b> OSCAR A. LOUIE</p>	<p><b>Art Unit</b> 2436</p>	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 26 July 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-24.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Nasser Moazzami/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicants' remarks with respect to "claims, the Office Action relies on the "mistrust level for each wireless network device" as reciting an initial system certainty value for the computer system. Office Action, pg. 5. Applicant respectfully disagrees. These mistrust levels correspond to individual levels associated with wireless network device located within a computer system. There is no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion of a single initial system certainty value for the computer system" and "contends that Coleman fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "increasing the system certainty value if the received data does not match a signature in the database" and "decreasing the system certainty value if the received data matches a signature in the database." While Coleman does disclose incrementing and decrementing the mistrust levels, Applicant respectfully contends that these changes are not based on either matching or not matching signatures. For instance, Coleman clearly states that "mistrust level decrementing is accomplished based on three parameters, described as follows: (1) a decrement timer DI exceeds a mistrust level decrement interval from the operational protection suite; (2) mistrust level four has been reached, the wireless network device 36, 38 successfully re-authenticates, and re-login is also successful; (3) manual intervention 90 from the network administrator 92." Coleman, 7 0121. Therefore, the decrementing process disclosed in Coleman is based only on timing, manual intervention, or re-authentication. There is no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion that matching or not matching a signature plays any role in this step" have been carefully considered but are non-persuasive; The examiner notes that the applicants' "initial system certainty value" can be equated to the individual "mistrust levels" of each wireless device system; that is, each "wireless device" corresponds to each computer system that is assigned a "mistrust level". It is also noted that the applicants' "signature" that the "increasing/decreasing" of the "system certainty value" is based on, as claimed, can include any event that would trigger a responsive action. Coleman, discloses "anomaly detection" including "digital signatures" for identifying whether to increase/decrease the "mistrust levels" associated with a wireless device.